

2001-51

>>> "Richard L. Davis" <rldavis@post.harvard.edu> 08/12/03 07:42PM >>>

One of the first things jurors always ask us is, 'What's this guy's history?' " said Washtenaw County Assistant Prosecutor J. Samuel Holtz, who prosecuted Santure.

"They always want to know that. These things would assist them in determining guilt or innocence of this person."

If the court's would use someone's violent history concerning all crimes with the intent of providing equal protection to all victims, there may be little to no argument.

The 14th amendment's Due Process Clause provides that "no state shall. . .deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." Ignoring due process for some and continuing to provide it to others would mean that the state values the lives, liberties, or property of some people more than others. Does it make sense that if my daughter is killed by someone she does not know, the state would "conceal" that persons violent past yet if she knew that person they would not? Does that actually make sense to anyone?

The United States Supreme Court in DeShaney v. Winnegago County Department of Social Services established that a state may not selectively deny its protective services without violating the Equal Protection Clause.

Without including every crime would you not be ignoring

- (1) Equal substantive due process
- (2) Equal protection
- (3) Equal procedural due process

Does this law actual purpose that those who die at the hands of strangers are not worth the same value of those who die at the hands of those they know.

Richard L. Davis

www.Familynonviolence.org